# Evaluation Factors

# Objective

- To use a uniform baseline against which an offeror’s  solution is compared to determine its value to the government.
- To ensure we measure how well each offeror meets our requirements.
- To use the absolute minimum number of factors necessary that will enable you to distinguish among the proposals (i.e., will be true discriminators).

# Minimum Evaluation Areas

- Price or cost
- Quality of the product or service
- Past performance ($100,000)

# Factors and Subfactors must:

- Be limited to those which (a) are expected to surface real and measurable discriminators between offerors and (b) have value enough to warrant the payment of a meaningful cost/price premium to obtain the measured discrimination.
- Be definable in readily understood qualitative terms (i.e., adjectival, colors, or other indicators); and
- Represent the key areas of importance and emphasis to be considered in the source selection decision.

## You may address the quality of the product or service through one or more non-cost evaluation factors

- Past and present performance (Prior experience)
- Compliance with solicitation requirements
- Technical excellence
- Management capability
- Personnel qualifications

# Developing Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

- Conduct market research and identify your probable universe of offerors.
- Brainstorm critical factors and subfactors.
- Identify key discriminators as evaluation factors and subfactors.
- Define the discriminators as evaluated factors and subfactors.

# Continued

- Get SSA approval of the list of factors and subfactors.
- Assess feedback during presolicitation exchanges to see if the choices are correct.
- As necessary, change the factors and subfactors before issuing the RFP.
- After issuance of the RFP, do not change the factors and subfactors without obtaining the SSA's approval and amending the RFP and SSP.

# Adjectival Ratings

# EXCELLENT

- The proposal strengths demonstrate an excellent understanding of the requirements and the new or proven approach significantly exceeds performance or capability standards. The proposal has several exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the government. The proposal has no weaknesses; normal contractor effort and normal government monitoring will be sufficient to minimize risk. The proposal is extensive, detailed, and exceeds all requirements and objectives; therefore, has a high probability of meeting the requirements with little or no risk to the government.

# GOOD

- The proposal demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements and the approach exceeds performance or capability standards. The proposal has one or more strengths that will benefit the government. Any proposal weakness has little potential to cause a disruption of schedule, an increase in cost, or a degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties. The proposal generally exceeds requirements in minor areas; therefore, has a good probability of meeting the requirements with little risk to the government.

# SATISFACTORY

- The proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the requirements and the approach meets performance or capability standards**.** The proposal has no strengths that will benefit the government. The proposal has no material weaknesses. Any proposal weakness can potentially cause a disruption of schedules, an increase in cost, or a degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close government monitoring will probably minimize any difficulties of risk. The proposal generally meets requirements; therefore, has an acceptable probability of meeting the requirements.

# MARGINAL

- The proposal demonstrates a limited understanding of the requirements and the approach only marginally meets performance or capability standards necessary for minimal contract performance. The proposal has minor omissions and demonstrates a misunderstanding of the requirement that may be corrected or resolved through discussions without a complete revision of the proposal. The approach has weaknesses that can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance even with special contractor emphasis, and close government monitoring.

# UNSATISFACTORY

- The proposal demonstrates a misunderstanding of the requirements and the approach fails to meet performance or capability standards. The proposal has major omissions and inadequate detail to assure the evaluators that the offeror has an understanding of the requirements. The proposal proposes an unacceptable risk and cannot meet the requirements without major revisions.

# 52.212-2 EVALUATION—COMMERCIAL ITEMS SAMPLES

Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 are equal in importance and, when combined, are slightly more important than factor 5. The subfactors within factors 1 and 2 are equal in importance. The government is interested in proposals that offer the best value in meeting the requirements with acceptable risk at a fair and reasonable price. Factor 5, however, could become the determinative selection factor if the technical proposals are determined to be substantially equal.

# Samples (Cont’d)

- Factors 1 through 3 are listed in the order of their importance. The subfactors under factors 1 through 3 are listed in the order of their importance.
- Factors 1 through 3, when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 4. The government is interested in proposals that offer the best value in meeting the requirements with acceptable risk at a fair and reasonable price. However, Factor 4 could become the determinative selection factor if the technical proposals are determined to be substantially equal.

# Evaluation of Non-Price Factors

- Determine what cost and/or management information will be provided to evaluators on the Source Selection Team for non-price factors.

# Evaluating Proposals - Source Selection Team

- The evaluation should normally include:

  - An analysis of technical and managerial elements of the proposal, including the implications of the proposed labor mix and hours/material mix, and quantities, tasks, schedules, and other such data.

  - An overall assessment of each proposal's potential for award.

  - Initial ratings and/or analysis of how each proposal rates against the solicitation's factors and any subfactors.

# Evaluating Proposals - Source Selection Team (Cont'd)

- Factual support for all findings and conclusions.
- Consideration of any need for communications to clarify offeror's proposal and, if necessary, specifics on what must be asked of the offeror.
- Consideration of any need to amend the RFP.
- Evaluating all proposals using the factors and subfactors of solicitation and previously prepared evaluation standards in the SSP.

# Evaluating Proposals - Source Selection Team (Cont'd)

- Not contacting any offerors or making on-site visits without Contracting Officer approval.
- Assuring that there is no real or apparent conflict of interest on the part of the evaluators.
- Not showing real or apparent favoritism to one offeror over another.

# Evaluating Proposals - Source Selection Team (Cont'd)

- Proposals MUST NOT be rated or scored against each other.
- Rating or scoring MUST be reliable and valid.

# Evaluation Factors

- DocumenT
- DOcumeNT
- DOCumENT
- DOCUMENT
- **DOCUMENT!!!!**

# Evaluation ratings or scoring must be documented, including:

- The basis for evaluation;
- An Analysis of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses against each non-price evaluation factor and subfactor identified in the solicitation;
- Identification of data (e.g., proposal labor mix and hours, quantities, tasks, or schedules) that were found to be inconsistent with other elements of the offeror's proposal, audit report, or data from other sources;
- A summary, matrix, or score of each proposal in relation to the best possible score; and an evaluation summary.

# Sample Evaluation Plan

| EVALUATION FACTOR | EVALUATION | ADJECTIVAL RATING |
|---|---|---|
| Factor 1. Key Personnel Qualifications | Personnel not qualified | Unsatisfactory |
| | Personnel may be qualified but insufficient information provided | Susceptible to being made acceptable (with additional information) |
| | Personnel meet requirement | Satisfactory |
| | Personnel meet all and exceed some requirements | Good |
| | Personnel exceed all requirements | Excellent |

| FACTOR 2. TECHNICAL APPROACH | EVALUATION | ADJECTIVAL RATING |
|---|---|---|
| Sub-factor 2.1. Proposed Methodology | Methodology poor and unorganized. High risk of failure. | Unsatisfactory |
| | Proposal demonstrates shallow understanding. Methodology has considerable risk. | Marginal |
| | Proposal demonstrates acceptable understanding. Methodology has good probability of meeting performance requirement, but few, if any, strengths. Risk is moderate to high. | Satisfactory |
| | Proposal demonstrates good understanding. Methodology has high probability of meeting or exceeding performance requirements and has one or more major strengths. Risk is moderate to low. | Good |
| | Proposal demonstrates excellent understanding. Methodology has high probability of exceeding performance requirements with significant strengths. Risk low. | Excellent |

# Conclusion

- As a result of this training you should have developed a more complete understanding of the evaluation process
- Remember a well documented document is a valuable asset.
- Make “Document, document, document…” your mantra.

# Evaluation Factors

QUESTIONS